



2013:11

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Jérôme Gouzou
Ian Christoplos
Jessica Rothman

Mid-term Review of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe

Final Report

Mid-term Review of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe

**Final Report
March 2013**

**Jérôme Gouzou
With Ian Christoplos and Jessica Rothman**

Authors: Jérôme Gouzou with Ian Christoplos and Jessica Rothman

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2013:11

Commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Zimbabwe

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: March 2013

Published by Citat 2013

Art. no. Sida61594en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61594en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Postgiro: 1 56 34-9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	3
PREFACE.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1 BACKGROUND	8
1.1 INTRODUCTION	8
2 METHODOLOGY.....	10
2.1 FOCUSING THE EVALUATION.....	10
2.2 CLARIFICATION OF THE USERS AND OF THE INTENDED USE OF THE EVALUATION	11
2.3 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	11
2.4 COMMENTS ON THE SOURCES	15
2.5 LIMITATIONS AND LESSONS	15
3 RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION.....	18
3.1 EVALUATION OF RELEVANCE.....	18
3.2 EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.....	26
3.3 EVALUATION OF EFFICIENCY	27
3.4 EVALUATION OF SUSTAINABILITY	30
4 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	33
ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE	36
ANNEX 2 – INCEPTION REPORT	39
ANNEX 3 – LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	49
ANNEX 4 – DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	51

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACPDT	Africa Community Publishing and Development Trust
AUSAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CAFOD	Catholic Agency for Overseas Development
CFD	Centre For Safety in Development
CO	Country Office
CR	Country Representative
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DFID	Department for International Development, UK
DHPI	Denis Hurley Peace Institute
FAA	Finance and Administration Assistant
FGI	Focus Group Interviews
FO	Finance Officer
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
Hivos	Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries
ICCO	Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation
NCA	Norwegian Church Aid
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
PO	Programme Officer
RBA	Rights-Based Approach
RBM	Results-Based Management
RO	Regional Office
SADC	South African Development Community
SCMZ	Student Christian Movement of Zimbabwe
SEK	Swedish Krona
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
YETT	Youth Empowerment and Transformation Trust
ZCC	Zimbabwe Council of Churches
ZPP	Zimbabwe Peace Project

Preface

This mid-term review, completed in early 2013, of Diakonia's programme *Strategic Peace Building in Zimbabwe (2012-2014)*, is a follow-up of an evaluation that was undertaken in 2011 of the previous phase of the programme.

The purpose of the mid-term review is to assess the performance of the programme and the capacity of Diakonia to implement the programme. The intended users of the evaluation are both Sida and Diakonia - it serves as a planning tool and a basis for decisions on future programme design.

The Embassy of Sweden in Zimbabwe commissioned Indevelop to undertake the evaluation through Sida's Framework Agreement for Reviews, Evaluations and Advisory Services on Results Frameworks.

The evaluation was undertaken by Mr. Jérôme Gouzou, a member of Indevelop's Core Team of professional evaluators. Mr. Gouzou undertook the previous evaluation of the programme in 2011.

Indevelop provided active management of the evaluation; quality assurance of the methodology and reports was provided by Ian Christoplos while Jessica Rothman coordinated and managed the process throughout.

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the mid-term review of Diakonia's programme Strategic Peace Building in Zimbabwe for the period 2012-2014 that was submitted to and funded by Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Zimbabwe. This evaluation, commissioned by the Embassy, is a follow-up of an evaluation of Diakonia's programme that was performed in 2011. It assesses and draws conclusions and recommendations on the first year of the new programme.

This mid-term review shows that numerous positive changes have taken place since the 2011 evaluation. Diakonia has taken the recommendations of the evaluation very seriously and has embarked upon a series of processes aimed at implementing each recommendation and at addressing the weaknesses that characterised its previous programme in Zimbabwe. Diakonia has, first of all, succeeded in putting in place an institutional set-up for an in-depth modification of the previous programme and the implementation of a new one. This was done through a three-fold approach (successful recruitment of new management and staff at the Harare office, greater involvement of the Regional Office in Nairobi and systematic use of competent national consultants) that proved highly relevant and effective. This new institutional set-up has been able to lay the ground for the development of a relevant and necessary process for critically assessing and learning from the shortcomings of the previous programme. It has contributed to creating an environment that is conducive to the development of a new programme by addressing key issues and helping to put the programme back on track. Diakonia has focused on restoring relationships with the partners in Zimbabwe, which had been damaged during the last three years. Diakonia has embarked on a frank dialogue with its partners that aims at critically assessing their relevance and performance while increasing their ownership of the programme through greater involvement in financial management issues, risk and conflict analysis. Diakonia has, moreover, been able to develop a capacity development strategy of remarkable quality. Finally, Diakonia has succeeded, in a short amount of time, in going from being totally unknown among international actors in Zimbabwe to being considered as a reliable partner that brings a true added value to the democratisation process in the country.

There are, however, a number of areas of the work that need to be improved. Diakonia still faces a series of challenges in relation to strategic planning. Despite an undeniable improvement of the quality of conflict analysis, it does not clearly lead to priorities for programming. The analysis suggests that the programme deals with strategic peace building without explaining what this means for Diakonia. The current programme is more focused than the previous one, but it is still too vague: the logical framework is too general, it fails to reflect what the partners want to achieve and the results (at output and outcome levels) of Diakonia's support to its partners should be

formulated in a more precise manner. The risk analysis is done in a systematic manner, but it largely focuses on the physical integrity of the partners (which is highly relevant) and neglects the capacity constraints of the partners in reaching their objectives. There is, and this is the most important aspect of the work that needs to be enhanced, a need for further reflection on what the programme is really about and what it may realistically achieve within a three-year period and beyond. A crucial part of this reflection concerns the current and future portfolio of partners. The main questions are if it is currently relevant to achieve the objectives of the programme and what types of competencies/profiles Diakonia may want for future partnerships. Moreover, despite improvements in the quality of the relationships between Diakonia and its partners, a sense of partnership has been insufficiently developed among its different partners. The conflict analysis shows that the lack of collaboration between Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) is a major obstacle to the emergence of an effective civil society in Zimbabwe, and the evaluator is convinced that the success of the current programme depends, to a large extent, on the capacity of Diakonia to create a sense of common interest among its partners.

We recommend Sida/Embassy of Sweden to:

- Provide Diakonia with technical support available within the Results Framework. This support should be ideally provided during the first half of 2013.
- This support should consist of training Diakonia staff and partners in Results-Based Management (RBM) and of helping Diakonia and its partners review their results frameworks included in the new programme.
- Take the initiative to facilitate contact between Diakonia and other potentially interested donors (Norway, Finland, Denmark, Department for International Development (DFID), German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) and possibly the Australian Agency for International Development (AU-SAID)), which would allow for more financial stability and sustainability for Diakonia's programme in Zimbabwe.

We recommend Diakonia to:

- Develop, throughout the implementation of the programme, clear indicators in its capacity building logical framework.
- Plan for a capacity building process in RBM for its partners' staff and their board members. Plan for capacity building of its partners in methods to analyse conflicts.
- Include clear links between conflict analysis and programming in these capacity building plans.
- Plan for greater time for conflict/context analysis during the partners' meetings.
- Define, in close collaboration with its partners, what a strategic peace building programme is, what it consists of in terms of problems to address in the context of Zimbabwe and in terms of relevant strategies to address them.
- Strategically choose one or two problems to address through its programme (Diakonia and its partners cannot address all the problems highlighted in the conflict analysis). This choice will depend on the experience and knowledge

of the partners, and their capacity to demonstrate an added value in addressing these problems.

- Further assess its current portfolio as a whole, not only individual organisations, and draw conclusions on its capacity to address and have an influence on the issues highlighted in the conflict analysis and/or on those that the partners agree to address in priority during the coming two years.
- Consider changing the current portfolio on the basis of the conclusions of the assessment suggested above (on qualitative and not on quantitative criteria).
- Implement the resource mobilisation strategy developed by Diakonia in Zimbabwe and share the results on a regular basis with Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Harare.

1 Background

1.1 INTRODUCTION

During 2009-2011, Diakonia implemented a country programme in Zimbabwe, focusing on democracy, peace and security. The programme was funded by Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Zimbabwe and through the Diakonia frame grant from Sida CIVSAM in Sweden. The programme was evaluated in mid-2011.¹ The evaluator concluded that the performance of the Diakonia programme had been mixed. There were serious weaknesses, but also promising areas for development. Among other things, most of the participating partner organisations were found to be highly relevant and important voice-bearers in the current development context of Zimbabwe. Among the weaknesses, the report mentions a lack of coherence and systematic capacity development of the partner organisations. Based on the evaluation, Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Harare decided to extend the programme an additional six months for the period January-June 2012, in order to allow Diakonia time to address the weaknesses and make use of the recommendations highlighted in the report. During this period, the Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe was developed.

The new programme was launched in July 2012 and runs until the end of 2014. The Swedish contribution is SEK 25,972,000, accounting for 85% of the budget. The programme budget includes an already approved contribution of MSEK 3,8 from Sida CIVSAM for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2014. The budget will be channelled via local implementing partner organisations in Zimbabwe that Diakonia works through. The programme started with 7 partners and aspires to reach 12 partners by the end of the period.

Given the challenges in the previous Diakonia programme, Sida/Embassy of Sweden has decided to commission an early mid-term review in 2013 to ensure that the new programme is being implemented according to plan, to assess the room for further expansion as well as to provide input to the general direction of the programme.

This purpose of the mid-term review is to assess the performance of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme and the capacity of Diakonia to implement the programme. The specific issues to be assessed are:

¹ Evaluation of Diakonia Programme 2009-2011; J. Gouzou, Indevalop, Sep 2011

1. The programme management capacity of Diakonia
2. The quality of the programme inception (January-December 2012)
3. The value addition of the programme

The review provides recommendations to both Sida and Diakonia on how to further improve programme delivery and on the future direction of the programme in relation to the plan.

2 Methodology

2.1 FOCUSING THE EVALUATION

This assignment started with an inception phase, during which the evaluator clarified the evaluation criteria and the scope of the evaluation. The initial Terms of Reference (ToR) indicated a series of evaluation questions. In its inception report, Indevelop suggested to amend some of the evaluation questions in order to make the assignment more feasible and to provide Sida and Diakonia with useful conclusions and recommendations.

The initial ToR stipulated two different purposes that sometimes contradicted each other. The evaluator suggested simplifying the formulation of the ToR through drafting one single purpose for this assignment. Evaluating the impact of the programme would have required resources (financial, technical, human and time) that were not available for this type of assignment. It is, moreover, not necessarily relevant when performing a mid-term review. Sida agreed with our suggestion to reformulate the purpose of the mid-term review as follows:

The purpose of the review is to assess the extent to which the new programme management and structure might contribute to reaching the objective of Diakonia's intervention in Zimbabwe (a strengthened civil society contributing to the change of structural conditions necessary for peace, gender equality and consolidated democracy in Zimbabwe).

Sida also agreed that this assignment addresses the following evaluation questions:

Relevance

- Which recommendations from the previous evaluation have been implemented? Which recommendations have not been implemented and why?
- Has the programme design been articulated in a coherent structure: are the outcomes and outputs clearly articulated?
- To what extent do the activities carried out address the causes of problems identified?
- Are the programme objectives addressing identified needs of the target group(s) in Zimbabwe?

Effectiveness

- To what extent does the programme contribute to reaching its objectives (outcomes)? In other words: are there indications that the programme contributes to reaching its outcomes?

Efficiency:

- To what extent have Diakonia's organisational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme so far?

Sustainability:

- Is the programme supported by regional/national/local institutions?
- Has the funding base been diversified? How has the work to obtain financial sustainability and reducing the dependency on Sida core support turned out?

2.2 CLARIFICATION OF THE USERS AND OF THE INTENDED USE OF THE EVALUATION

On the donor side, the main user of the evaluation is Sida. Some other donors might, however, be interested in the findings. This evaluation is intended to help Sida to better understand the work of Diakonia and to serve as a basis when deciding on future commitments with the organisation.

For Diakonia, the evaluation is an opportunity to have someone from the outside reflect on the strategies, accomplishments and on the organisational structure and capacity. The assessment is not only meant to look backwards but also to use the findings, insights and lessons to inform the implementation of the new programme. Following the evaluation performed in 2011, Diakonia's programme has gone through a series of changes at organisational and content levels. The evaluation is an opportunity to gain expert advice on the focus and approach in the new programme.

The evaluation is also an opportunity to provide evidence to potential donors and partners regarding the value of Diakonia as a partner in Zimbabwe.

2.3 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

2.3.1 General Approach

This assignment has integrated different methods. They have been adapted to the various types of informants and information that the evaluator believes were necessary to approach and to collect. The evaluator has incorporated a mix of three key methods to analyse the information in a variety of ways.

i. Analysis of the available documentation

The evaluator has analysed all relevant documents provided by Diakonia (proposal, narrative reports of the programme, analysis of partner organisations, minutes from meetings with partners, capacity building/empowerment material, advocacy campaigns' documents), the documents provided by Sida (assessment memos, decisions) and a few documents provided by Diakonia's partner organisations. The purpose of

this analysis was to trace important information related to the relevance and efficiency of the organisation.

ii. Interviews

The evaluation used different interview techniques, depending on the type of information that needed to be collected.

One-on-one interviews with key informants

This method has been primarily used with Diakonia leadership in Harare, and with representatives from partner organisations. Key informants who do not belong to Diakonia staff were selected in relation to the type of information that the evaluator needed in order to assess the relevance and the effectiveness of Diakonia (partners, other international and local NGOs working in Zimbabwe, consultants used by Diakonia in the implementation of the programme). The one-on-one interviews have been conducted using a mix of forced-choice questions (mainly aimed at clarifying the role of the informant in Diakonia's programme or specific activity) and of open-ended questions aimed at collecting the perception of the informant on the strategy used by Diakonia and the possible effects that the intervention has had on his/her organisation or on the process that he/she participated in.

Focus Group Interviews (FGI)

This method has mainly been used with Diakonia staff in Harare, with Diakonia's partners and with other international and local NGOs. The FGIs have been conducted using open-ended and one-dimensional questions that allowed the respondents to elaborate on the questions and build on each other's answers. This method has mainly been used to assess the relevance of Diakonia's interventions and the efficiency of the organisation. For these two purposes, a set of questions aimed at collecting relevant information has been prepared. Both one-on-one interviews and FGIs used semi-structured questions. Departing from prepared sets of questions that followed the issues highlighted in the ToR, the evaluation team also let the respondents talk about what was important to them. This approach, which sometimes allowed the interviewees to bring in aspects or issues other than those planned by the evaluators, has proven very useful to add qualitative information to purely structured interviews.

2.3.2 Evaluation criteria and questions

i. Assessing relevance

This evaluation is meant to assess Diakonia's programme, which means that it should address the support provided by Diakonia to its partners and the work of the partners themselves.

As this review is a follow-up of the 2011 evaluation, two key questions have first guided the evaluator:

- Which recommendations from the previous evaluation have been implemented?
- Which recommendations have not been implemented and why?

The relevance criterion is meant to assess the extent to which the outcomes/objectives of a project or a programme are valid and adequate, whether in their initial form or after they have been adjusted. The relevance criterion allows answering the following question: Does Diakonia (and, where relevant, its implementing partners) do the right thing? Doing the right thing or being relevant implies two things:²

- To what extent are the strategy and the programme/project of Diakonia appropriate in relation to the needs and priorities of the target groups?
- To what extent are the strategy and the programme/project of Diakonia appropriate in relation to the objectives of Swedish development cooperation in Zimbabwe?

The relevance criterion is also meant to focus on the consistency of the logic of a given intervention. Assessing relevance means, thus, to evaluate the extent to which the activities and outputs of the programme are consistent with the attainment of its objectives.

Finally, and beyond the two dimensions mentioned above, the relevance criterion also relates to the responsiveness of organisations. Does Diakonia take into account changes in the environment in which the organisation intervenes? The following two questions have guided our thoughts in that matter:

- To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?
- If any, are the new activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended effects?

In order to be as objective and transparent as possible, a two-step qualitative rating system was applied to the assessment questions. The evaluator has used the same method as the one used for the evaluation of September 2011. This allows for a comparative analysis of progress made by Diakonia and its partners.

First step: The evaluators provide a grade for each question (Cf. Box 1) and comments explaining/justifying the reason for the grade.

Box 1: The grading system:

D: not performed by Diakonia because it is not in the organisation's mandate
C: not done by Diakonia, although it could/should have been
B: Diakonia attempts to do it, but there is room for improvement
A: Diakonia does it well

Second step: Synthesise findings for each chapter.

² Cf. Sida at Work

- The evaluator counts the number of A, B, C and/or Ds.
- The evaluator synthesises the comments in order to give a global picture of the relevance of Diakonia. This results in a rating system that is presented in Box 2.

Box 2: The rating system

Doubtful relevance: majority of D or C

Organisation potentially relevant: majority of B

Organisation highly relevant: majority of A

ii. *Assessing effectiveness*

In order to assess the extent to which the expected outputs and outcomes formulated in Diakonia's proposal have been achieved, the evaluator led a series of interviews with key informants and visited each partner organisation. The focus was on the capacity building Diakonia provided to its partners. The following questions aimed at finding evidence of effectiveness during the interviews and the field visits:

- To what extent do the activities of Diakonia's programme contribute to reaching their outputs? Meaning: have Diakonia's capacity building efforts generated new knowledge?
- To what extent has this newly acquired knowledge been used by the partners?
- To what extent is it possible to trace some effects of these new working tools/methods?

iii. *Assessing efficiency*

The efficiency criterion aims at assessing the extent to which human and financial resources have been used in an optimal manner. As mentioned in section 1 of this report, the evaluation has focused on the following question: To what extent have Diakonia's organisational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme so far?

This is an important aspect of the review, as the evaluation performed in September 2011 had highlighted a series of deficiencies at that level. The evaluator has used the recommendations from the evaluation to structure this part of the review and assess the progress made by Diakonia on efficiency. The review has focused on assessing the extent to which Diakonia:

- Has recruited some technical staff for the Harare office, with competencies in capacity development and in the thematic area(s) that the programme is focusing on; and/or
- Is using more systematically competent local consultants to perform the capacity development dimension of Diakonia's work; and/or
- Has revised its thematic priorities; and/or
- Has mobilised more resources from the Nairobi office to provide more systematic technical support to the Harare staff.

iv. *Assessing sustainability*

In this evaluation, the focus for the sustainability criterion was on ownership and the replicability of Diakonia's projects and on its financial dependency on Sida's funding. The following question have guided the work of the evaluator:

- Do regional/national/local institutions support the programme?
- Has the funding base been sufficiently diversified? What has been the result of the work to obtain financial sustainability and reduce the dependency on Sida's support, and is this sufficient?

2.4 COMMENTS ON THE SOURCES

The interviews were carefully planned to include key people within partner organisations and other actors expected to give constructive external opinions on the programme. The informants from each category were selected as follows:

- Diakonia provided information on the programmes of each partner and put the evaluator in contact with the relevant partners' staff.
- Diakonia planned meetings with each of its partners in Harare. The evaluator led these meetings without the presence of Diakonia staff.
- Other important stakeholders and observers have been selected based on the evaluator's network in Zimbabwe, in order to get information that cannot be suspected as biased. Whenever possible, other actors (international and local NGOs) have been approached. The objective of meeting other international and local actors was to gain a clearer picture of what it entails to work with sensitive issues in the country.
- It is worth noting that the collaboration with Diakonia and its partners has been very fruitful, with each of them providing key documents and a willingness to discuss their strengths, while also being very open to exchanges about their weaknesses. Diakonia and its partners have even invited the evaluator to participate in the partners' meeting that took place in Harare on 19-20 February. He was welcome to attend every session, and some time was reserved during the schedule for FGIs on the relevance of peace building interventions in the current political context and on the possibility of CSOs to address the main causes of the conflicts. The evaluator was even able to share some of his findings with Diakonia's staff and partners at the end of the first day's session. We feel it important to highlight this effort in order to be totally transparent as a finding in itself.

2.5 LIMITATIONS AND LESSONS

Within the framework of this assessment, the evaluator visited the partner organisations based in Harare; each of them is different in their nature, mandate and organisational structure. They are active in different parts of the country with specific contextual issues. A great amount of time has been spent with the Diakonia team and management in order to better understand the logic of the programme, as well as with other informants to gain a fair picture of the opportunities and constraints that are faced by organisations aiming at bringing democracy, respect for human rights and gender issues onto the national agenda. Our method has attempted to, as much as is possible, minimise difficulties linked to dealing with complex issues in complex environments. We would, however, like to highlight the following limitations:

- This assessment cannot be considered a full-fledged relevance and/or effectiveness evaluation. This mid-term review should be seen as a learning tool for Diakonia and Sida. It aims at providing Diakonia with strategic guidance on several aspects of its work that require further reflection in the next phase of its programme. It is also meant to provide Sida with insights on Diakonia's work in order to optimise its support in the future.
- The issue of attribution has been a constant concern for the evaluator. Due to time, and human and financial constraints, it was not possible to fully evaluate the effectiveness of Diakonia's programme and/or draw conclusions on the effective changes (at outcome level) that could be attributed to Diakonia. What the evaluator has been able to highlight are the contributions of Diakonia.
- It would have been relevant and interesting to spend time in each region where Diakonia's partners are active in the field. It would have enabled the evaluator to verify the credibility of the claims made by Diakonia and by its partners. The evaluator was given the opportunity to visit one activity outside Harare during his stay in the country. However, the evaluator was convinced that using 30% of the time spent in the country to visit one single activity, undertaken by one partner, would not be efficient. The time and resources allocated for this assessment did not allow for systematic field visits outside Harare.
- The evaluator had planned to perform a thorough relevance evaluation of Diakonia's new partner, the Zimbabwe Peace Project (ZPP) in order to collect data that would be comparable to the ones collected from the other partners in 2011. This was, however, not possible, as ZPP was going through a difficult time before and during our visit in Zimbabwe. The police had launched a raid on ZPP's office a few days prior to our arrival in Harare, during which cell phones and much of ZPP's documentation were confiscated. Moreover, the Director of ZPP was under a threat of police arrest during the evaluator time spent in the country. As a result, the meeting planned on 21 February was cancelled.³ The evaluator had, however, the opportunity to briefly meet with ZPP's Director before the end of the mission.
- The two partners based in South Africa, Denis Hurley Peace Institute (DHPI) and SA1, were not thoroughly evaluated in 2011, as time constraints did not allow the evaluator to visit their offices nor to visit the work of DHPI in Bulawayo. Similar limits apply, to a large extent, to this mid-term review. The evaluator was, however, able to spend some time with one staff member from DHPI during Diakonia's partner's meeting in Harare, which was very useful to better understand the work of the organisation and more accurately assess

³ The daily newspaper, The Herald, had as his major headline "NGO stuck into espionage case" on its 21 February edition.

its relevance. As a result, this review cannot draw any conclusion on the relevance of SA1.

This review shows an important lesson that the evaluator believes Sida should learn from and possibly replicate in other similar situations: supporting and accompanying a transition period for a programme whose performance has been severely questioned by an evaluation is a good investment. The example of Diakonia, which relies to a large extent on new management, a critical evaluation of previous partnership and approaches, and on greater support provided by the regional office, shows that such a process leads to the development of a more relevant and efficient programme.

The use of the same evaluator to perform the 2011 evaluation and this mid-term review proved to be effective and efficient. We are convinced that the knowledge of the organisation, of the previous programmes, with its weaknesses, challenges and strengths, and of the partners, enhanced the credibility and legitimacy of the analysis and conclusions included in this report. It also allowed for an optimised use of the time that was allocated for the review.

Apart from making sure that gathered information answers the evaluation questions, our approach and the focus on utilisation have ensured that the evaluation process would allow Diakonia, their partners and stakeholders to reflect on their work and, thus, learn from the evaluation process. The evaluator has shared the initial findings of the evaluation with Diakonia's team in Harare, with a representative of Diakonia's regional office in Nairobi and with Sida's staff at the Embassy.

None of the external informants have provided information that might question the trustworthiness of the information collected through the staff and the partners. This strengthens our confidence in the credibility of the results of this assessment.

3 Results of the Evaluation

3.1 EVALUATION OF RELEVANCE

3.1.1 Relevance of Diakonia's inception phase of the new programme

This part of the evaluation addresses the relevance of Diakonia approaches, methodologies and strategies during the transition period and the beginning of the implementation phase of its new programme.

i. Relevance to the context

Relevance question	Grade
To what extent does the programme include a context/conflict analysis?	A

The 2011 evaluation showed that the fact that Diakonia performed a conflict analysis before even drafting a proposal was a very positive aspect of its work. However, there was a principal problem with this analysis. It was meant to both analyse the conflict and suggest programmatic implications, but the analysis part was far too general. It only stated a series of problems while never trying to highlight the complexity of each of them; and it failed to even attempt to explain how these different problems were interacting with each other. The analysis of the different actors was very shallow.

Following up on the evaluation, Diakonia launched a new conflict analysis process in September 2011 with the help of a consultant who was employed part-time at Diakonia. This process was highly participatory, as it relied, to a great extent, on a series of consultations with the partners who were gathered to perform the analysis. The result is a document that is far more solid and detailed than the previous analysis from November 2008. The analysis follows a classic academic method of conflict analysis. The conflict issues are clearly highlighted and analysed. The analysis of the actors is more in-depth and elaborated than the previous one. The analysis of the conflict dynamic shows the complexity of the interactions between the actors, attitudes, behaviours and the changes in the way they define/formulate the nature of the problems at stake. The purely analytical part of the conflict analysis is of very good quality.

Relevance question	Grade
To what extent does the context analysis lead to clear options for programming?	B

Actors involved in development or peace building are not supposed to perform conflict analyses for the sake of doing them, but rather because these exercises are intended to inform and influence the development of their interventions. The evaluation of 2011 showed that the conflict analysis was not comprehensive enough to base a programme upon. The risks, and risk mitigation strategies, related to being engaged in

peace building needed to be carefully assessed and developed. Diakonia outlined ways of resolving conflict and promoting development around the promotion of dialogue, mediation and reconciliation, and engaging the people and the State. While this was a standard academic/intellectual framework, the reality of this practice and implementation in contemporary Zimbabwe needed to be based on a more careful examination of available options for conflict prevention. The conflict analysis did not shed light on these options.

Diakonia and its partners have made considerable efforts, during the conflict analysis process, and especially since the inception of the new programme in July 2012, to improve the quality of their risk analysis and management. Partners meet regularly to share their analyses of potential risks and to develop the strategies aimed at lowering them. Most of their efforts are geared towards the protection of the integrity of persons, which is highly relevant in the current context in Zimbabwe, and on the protection of the documentation of their activities. This part of the risk analysis, including what it might entail to be involved in peace building activities, and the risk mitigation strategies put in place by Diakonia and its partners, are of good quality and are far more advanced than the ones that were in place during the last programme. The revised risk analysis framework (Risk Register, 21 November 2012) mentions planning risks and even underlines the potential lack of relevance of the partners' programmes. This is a positive development that needs to be highlighted. However, the risk analyses performed by Diakonia and its partners do not sufficiently address programmatic risks. There is very little attention, if any, to the effects of potential changes in the political context on the capacity of the partners to maintain as they are and/or reach the objectives of their programmes. We will get back to this issue in the section dedicated to the logic of programming, but this is an area of Diakonia's work that needs to be further improved.

The main problem with the conflict analysis is that it partly fails to highlight clear options for programming for Diakonia. More specifically, there is a gap between the directions suggested by the conflict analysis and Diakonia's formulation of its new programme. The last one and a half pages of the analysis (*pointers to programming*) underline four potential strategies:

- Need to increase cooperation between CSOs in order to have an influence on key issues at stake;
- Need for CSOs to engage with key/powerful actors;
- Need for CSOs to engage with the youth; and
- Need to deal with internal divisions/polarisation within civil society in Zimbabwe.

The evaluator is convinced that these potential directions for programming are all highly relevant, but that they have not yet been fully transformed into clear objectives in Diakonia's programme. We will further develop this question in the section dedicated to the focus of the new programme, but there still is no clear developed strategy for strengthening democratisation through peace and conflict management or strategic peace building. This is a complex question and the main challenge faced by Diakonia

in its programme, as it concerns the current portfolio of partners and their will and capacities to work with some of the strategic directions highlighted in the conflict analysis.

Relevance question	Grade
To what extent is the context analysis based on a Rights-Based Approach and a gender perspective?	A

The evaluation of 2011 showed that, despite its weaknesses, the conflict analysis was rather strong on mainstreaming a Rights-Based Approach (RBA) and a gender perspective. The conflict analysis performed in 2012 is even of better quality on that level. The concepts are clearly highlighted when presented separately, and they are moreover mainstreamed throughout the document. In addition, Diakonia has corrected the lack of reference made to international documents that have been ratified by Zimbabwe and that should also serve as a reference for working on the implementation of rights in the country.

ii. Relationships with partners

Relevance question	Grade
What is the rationale for selecting the partners and what attitude does Diakonia adopt towards partners that do not deliver according to plans?	A

The 2011 evaluation showed that Diakonia had used a relevant list of criteria, but that the organisation had more particularly based its work on a continuation of previous partnerships. The experience of working with these organisations had been a determining factor.

Since the inception of the new programme, Diakonia has taken the necessary time to perform in-depth evaluations of each partner organisation with the help of national consultants and through a series of meetings between Diakonia staff and the partners. There are several positive lessons to be learnt from this process. First, Diakonia has engaged with its partners in a more critical, and at the same time constructive, manner than during the previous programme. This has led Diakonia to put an end to its financial partnership with one organisation, Zimbabwe Council of Churches (ZCC) that did not fully meet the criteria, and to lower its financial support to another one, Student Christian Movement of Zimbabwe (SCMZ). Ending or considerably lowering the financial partnership does not mean putting an end to the relations, as these organisations participate in the partners' meetings and they benefit from Diakonia's capacity building efforts. Moreover, Diakonia is engaged in helping them find other financial partners. Secondly, Diakonia has put a strong emphasis on involving the board members of its partners during their evaluation and the dialogue meetings. This is a new and very positive development. Future evaluations of Diakonia's programme in Zimbabwe may be interested in assessing the effects of increased involvement of the boards on the performance of their organisations. The third element of interest to take

into account is that Diakonia has, in its critical dialogue with its partners, insisted on the fact that 2013 was a period in which they had to demonstrate that they were able to deliver according to their plans and/or to adequately adapt their plans to changes in the political environment. This notion of performance as one important criterion is new in Diakonia's approach to partnership in Zimbabwe, and the evaluator believes that it is another positive change. The experience of working with these organisations is still a determining factor, but it is now weighted with other criteria (relevance, efficiency and effectiveness).

The question of the choice of new partners in the coming phases of the programme is dealt with in the section on the focus of the programme.

Relevance question	Grade
To what extent are the methodologies and modalities of the support to strengthen the capacities of partners adequate?	A

The 2011 evaluation showed that Diakonia had focused most of its efforts on strengthening the financial and reporting capacities of its partners, which was positive and appreciated by the partners. But the evaluation also showed that the thematic capacity development efforts had been almost totally non-existent. We recommended Diakonia to urgently embark upon an individual dialogue with each of its partners in Zimbabwe in order to develop a series of capacity development plans on the themes that are relevant for the work of their partners. These plans should be based on, and spread over, the funding period. These plans should have clearly stipulated and realistic objectives that would be included in the future proposal submitted for funding to Sida/Embassy of Harare.

Diakonia has embarked on a solid process to deal with the shortcomings highlighted in the 2011 evaluation. This process has been highly participatory as it is based on a thorough assessment of the partners' capacities and on a clear formulation of their needs, which were established in the organisational assessments carried out by Diakonia in late 2011. All partners, for example, have expressed the need for security training. Demand-driven trainings have taken place, including security training (support to development of organisational safety and security plans) and support to strengthened monitoring systems. In the latter, a consultant has been commissioned to provide tailor-made and long-term support to the partners on an individual basis. The objective of this approach is to support the strengthening and/or development of the partners' own systems. Capacity development needs have been followed up during the formal semi-annual review meetings and again during the partners' meeting in February 2013.

Moreover, Diakonia has developed an overall capacity building strategy for the programme (still in draft form). The process, launched in 2012, aimed to transform the regional capacity development strategy into a national one. There is a strong empha-

sis on the strategy of helping partners to achieve objectives. This document contains a series of very positive aspects:

- It is, first of all, a comprehensive strategy, as it addresses organisational, administrative, financial and thematic issues;
- The strategy includes and details the role of Diakonia as a link between its partners and other potential donors;
- It integrates capacity building as a means to formulate clear objectives and to achieve them;
- It is synthesised in a logical framework format in which the logic of capacity development (its objectives) is clearly formulated for Diakonia and for its partners; and
- The document establishes clear links between this capacity development strategy for each partner and Diakonia's monitoring and evaluation process so that partners can report on the way that they have used the newly acquired knowledge (which will become outcome indicators for Diakonia).

However, despite its undeniable quality, the strategy does not put enough emphasis on the adequate level of capacity building required to allow for capacities to be really enhanced. The main issue for Diakonia, as well as for its partners, when they themselves perform capacity building for their target groups, is to know, and thus to define, what it means to have reached the point of enhanced capacities. This is an aspect of the strategy document that needs to be improved.

Plans will be developed in details for each partner at the beginning of 2013 on the basis of a ten-step good-capacity-building approach. Diakonia has deliberately delayed this in order to first attain a better understanding of the partners' real needs and, thus, to develop adequate plans for each of them; the evaluator believes it is a sound approach. This is, indeed, a major challenge for Diakonia, as the organisation is concerned with identifying the best possible method to provide capacity building given the heterogeneity of its partners in terms of needs and current levels of knowledge.

We therefore recommend Diakonia to:

- **Develop, throughout the implementation of the programme, clear indicators in its capacity building logical framework. These indicators shall consist of:**
 - **Progress indicators showing the level of knowledge acquired during the training sessions (output level)**
 - **Performance indicators showing the extent to which newly acquired knowledge is being put into practice (outcome level)**
- **Consider a mix of organisation-based and of collective capacity building approaches.**

3.1.2 Relevance of Diakonia's partners

During the 2011 evaluation, the relevance of Diakonia's partners was assessed thoroughly. In this section, we refer to the most significant findings from 2011 that have been updated by information collected in the field for the mid-term review and Diakonia's own evaluation of partners from 2012. It is worth noting that the findings and

conclusions from the 2011 evaluation are, to a large extent, still valid for most of the partners and that Diakonia's assessment confirms them. As explained in the methodology part, the focus of this section is on the partners' portfolio rather than on each organisation.

i. Logic of programming

Relevance question	Grade
To what extent are the activities and outputs of the partners' programmes consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of their objectives?	B

As already mentioned in the 2011 evaluation, this is still, probably, one of the weakest aspects of the work of Diakonia's partners. On the one hand, some organisations such as Youth Empowerment and Transformation Trust (YETT), African Community Publishing and Development Trust (ACPD), ZPP and to some extent DHPI are showing strong strategic thinking. These organisations are capable of showing clear and logical causality chains when they present their programme. On the other hand, the project/programme management tools that they use do not seem to offer a quality standard on which the projects/programme is supposed to be based and reliant on. They seem to use the management tools because they are compulsory, but they do not fully understand (because they have not yet received adequate capacity development support) why and how each of them strengthens the quality of their projects/programmes and increases the probability that the outcomes will be reached, and thus limits the risk of not achieving the originally formulated objectives. The problem with Diakonia's partners is that the programme logic is not accurately represented in their logical frameworks. There is no reporting on output level, and most of the time the outputs are presented as quantified activities, which is incorrect. The 2011 evaluation showed that this weakness had a negative influence on their narrative reports, where the outputs consist of listing of number of undertaken workshops or training sessions, and where the outcomes (which are normally intended effects on the problems to be tackled) consist of examples of increased knowledge. Diakonia's own assessment of the reports that were sent by the partners in 2012 shows that this problem is persistent, with too much emphasis on activities and very little on achieved results. This weakness was confirmed during the partners' meeting that took place in February 2013, where they, without any exception, presented an account of the activities that had been undertaken during the first year of the new programme without ever referring to their relevance (what problems do the projects try to influence, what causes do these activities address?) nor to their effectiveness (what direct results and/or what effects have they recorded?).

In general, the quality of the reports does not reflect the quality of the work performed by the organisations. It also creates obstacles to proper programme monitoring. This limitation, which is to a large extent the consequence of a lack of capacity development support, would need to be addressed by Diakonia in close collaboration

with each partner. The national consultant, who works in close relationship with Diakonia in Harare, has reached the same conclusion in her assessment of the partners.

We therefore recommend Sida to:

- **Provide Diakonia with technical support available within the Results Framework. Ideally, this support should be provided during the first half of 2013.**
- **This support should consist of training Diakonia staff and partners in Results-Based Management (RBM) and of helping Diakonia and its partners review their results frameworks included in the new programme.**

We therefore recommend Diakonia to plan for a capacity building process in RBM for its partners' staff and their board members. This capacity building project should focus on enhancing their skills on:

- **Methods to perform a problem analysis**
- **Transforming a problem analysis into the formulation of objectives/outcomes**
- **Developing strategies/activities that clearly address the causes of the problem**
- **Methods to integrate programme-related risks in risk analysis**
- **Integrating elements of outcome mapping in Diakonia project management, especially:**
 - **The identification and analysis of boundary partners**
 - **The formulation of outcome challenges with each boundary partner, which will allow Diakonia and its partners to develop relevant and quality indicators throughout the implementation phase of their programmes.**

ii. Capacity to analyse the context

Relevance question	Grade
To what extent do the partners perform conflict/context analyses and to what extent do they use them to strategically inform/orientate their programmes?	B-C

With the noticeable exception of ACPDT, which has undertaken a workshop on conflict analysis with the help of an international consultant, the other partners do not regularly perform conflict analyses. Most of them might, in their staff meetings or during network meetings in which they participate, discuss the evolution of the political situation; but it is never in systematic written form, nor do they follow a proper method. The conflict analysis launched by Diakonia in 2011 has not been revised since then. The partners' meeting of February 2013 should have been an occasion to go back to the document, analyse potential changes in the dynamics and possibly amend it, but insufficient time was dedicated to this exercise. Most partners consider a conflict analysis to consist of enumerating a series of events, but they do not analyse the situation in depth, nor do they use this analysis to inform and/or orientate their

programme. This is a part of Diakonia's work with its partners that needs further improvement in the continuation of the programme.

We therefore recommend Diakonia to:

- **Plan for the capacity building of its partners in methods to analyse conflicts.**
- **Include clear links between conflict analysis and programming in these capacity building plans.**
- **Plan greater time for conflict/context analysis during the partners' meetings.**

3.1.3 Relevance of Diakonia's programme to Sida's strategic priorities in Zimbabwe

Relevance question	Grade
To what extent is Diakonia's programme relevant in relation to Sida's priorities/strategies in Zimbabwe?	A

This part of the relevance criteria was thoroughly analysed by Sida in its assessment of Diakonia's programme proposal in June 2012. This section will only highlight the main arguments.

The Diakonia programme is based on a rights perspective and the perspective of the poor, which is the basis of Swedish development aid. The Diakonia partner organisations work with peace building initiatives at different levels. The core of Diakonia's support is to increase the rights based perspective within the partner organisations with the objective of increasing legitimacy and downward accountability. The Diakonia Programme is, moreover, in line with the requirements of the Policy on Peace and Security for Development 2010-2014.⁴ The policy stipulates that the overarching objective of Swedish support in the context of security and development is to contribute to a lasting peace that makes development possible. The major tenets of this policy are dialogue, conflict management, transitional justice and security sector reform. The Diakonia programme also contributes to the fulfilment of the "Change for Freedom: Policy for Democratic Development and Human Rights in Swedish Development Cooperation, 2010-2014". This policy gives priority to three focus areas: 1) civil and political rights, 2) the institutions and procedures of democracy and the rule of law, and 3) actors of democratisation. Pluralism Policy for Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries within Swedish International Development Cooperation (2009) is the final relevant policy for this assessment. The objective of Swedish support is to

⁴ Peace and Security for Development: Policy for Security and Development in Swedish Development Cooperation 2010-2014.

promote: “a vibrant and pluralistic civil society in developing countries that, using a rights-based approach, contributes effectively to reducing poverty in all its dimensions”.⁵ The Diakonia Programme aims to support and strengthen civil society in all key areas that are identified in the policy.

Finally, the Diakonia programme is in line with the recently developed Zimbabwe Unit Programme on Peace Building and Reconciliation, which seeks to work with mandated institutions and civil society organisations in Zimbabwe to facilitate peace building and national healing. The programme seeks to operationalise the policy on Peace and Security for Development (2010-2014), and incorporate aspects of conflict management, transitional justice and security sector reform.

3.2 EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

This part of the evaluation assesses the extent to which the knowledge acquired by the participants in Diakonia capacity development sessions has been used to undertake organisational changes, to develop new policies and/or new working tools or methods, and whether Diakonia’s work has led to tangible results (at output and outcome levels). It is thus important to remember that the programme started in July 2012, and that the first six months were dedicated to evaluating the partners. Review meetings have been held with all partners, decision memos have been finalised in July/August and new agreements have been signed. Most partners received their first disbursements in August 2012, along with a few in early September. Assessing the results of the work of the partners after four months is not relevant. However, we have tried to highlight some initial results of Diakonia’s support to its partners.

Most capacity building efforts that have been undertaken so far have been geared towards strengthening the partners’ capacities in financial management and narrative reporting. A few trends might be highlighted.

- On the positive side, Diakonia’s partners have been reporting in a timely fashion. The quality of their financial reporting has generally been improved, with some partners performing better than others.
- The quality of the narrative reports remains relatively poor, as most partners’ reports focus on activities and not on results. This tends to show that improving the quality of narrative reporting requires a long-term commitment and it cannot be achieved through a limited number of training sessions.
- Another positive result concerns the development of risk management strategies that are developed by each partner.

⁵ Pluralism, Policy on Sweden's Support to Civil Society, Government offices of Sweden, 2009, page 5.

- The use of national consultants to support the partners' capacities in RBM has led to the development of monitoring and evaluation plans for four of them (YETT, ACPDT, Silveira House and SCMZ).
- A direct result of Diakonia's approach with its partners is their increased ownership and responsibility in parts of the programme. They draft the agenda of the partners' meetings and take responsibility to facilitate each session. Moreover, Diakonia has launched a very innovative approach with the Finance Forum meetings: finance officers from partner organisations have formed their own forum for the exchange of experience, support and learning. It is coordinated by Diakonia but is led by partners (YETT is the chair).

3.3 EVALUATION OF EFFICIENCY

The issues raised in the 2011 evaluation report led the evaluator to judge that the institutional set-up was not appropriate. There was too much to do for one single staff member in charge of managing the office, doing advocacy and providing adequate support to the partners. The support from the Nairobi office has consisted of a couple of short visits per year from the Advisor on Methodology. In order to increase the probability that the institutional set-up would be appropriate to the realisation of the objectives of its programmes, Diakonia had to make obvious strategic choices. This mid-term review attempts to answer the following questions, which were formulated as recommendations in the previous evaluation:

- Has Diakonia recruited some technical staff for the Harare office, with competencies in capacity development and in the thematic area(s) that the programme is focusing on?
- Is Diakonia using more systematically competent local consultants to perform the capacity development dimension of Diakonia's work?
- Has Diakonia revised its thematic priorities?
- Has Diakonia mobilised more resources from the Nairobi office to provide more systematic technical support to the Harare staff?

3.3.1 Diakonia organisational structure

Major changes have taken place at the level of the Harare office. The Country Office (CO) now has a competent team that consists of four staff: one Country Representative (CR), one Programme Officer (PO), one Finance Officer (FO) and one Finance and Administration Assistant (FAA). According to all external stakeholders that were interviewed during the field visit, the recruitment has been very successful. The new CR has, through her approach, her will to address the recommendations from the evaluation, her knowledge of Zimbabwe and of the constraints faced by CSOs in the country, her will to open up to other international actors in Harare and her experience of working with civil society, meant a lot for the positive changes that have occurred in a short amount of time. The CR is strongly supported by a new PO, who is a gender specialist founder of the first Zimbabwean men's organisations on gender, well known among civil society organisations in Zimbabwe and seen as legitimate by Diakonia's partners. Diakonia has, moreover, recruited an FO who is knowledgeable in

programme management and RBM, and who is able to make clear links between the inputs (both human and financial resources) that are necessary to mobilise in order to make the partners' projects more relevant and efficient.

Diakonia has also established a small group of highly competent national consultants who are systematically used to strengthen the quality of the programme. They are supporting Diakonia's partners with the development of their monitoring systems, they have performed studies such as the one on collaboration opportunities to strengthen the nexus between peace building and gender, and they carried out the partner satisfaction survey in December 2012. Diakonia has, moreover, worked with a few international consultants, including MDF Netherlands, who provided training in outcome mapping (in which the national consultants participated in order to strengthen the local resource base), as well as the Centre for Safety in Development (CFD), also based in the Netherlands, who provided the security training.

3.3.2 Support from the regional office

Positive changes have taken place at this level as well. First of all, the Regional Office (RO) mobilised adequate resources during the period September-December 2011 to prepare for the transition: an international consultant with a strong profile in peace and conflict issues was recruited to perform the conflict analysis and draft the new proposal, and several staff from the RO were made available to fully serve the Zimbabwe programme. The second reason that might explain this positive change is linked to a change in attitude from the new staff at the CO. The CR and her colleagues have, since they have been recruited, very actively requested the support that they needed. As a result, the RO has mobilised the resources necessary to, for example, support the CO in the development of its Programme Monitoring Framework, participate in training on outcome mapping. Moreover, both the CR and the PO have undergone introduction training at the regional office. In addition, the CO requested an internal audit to ensure that their administration and internal control systems were of good quality. Most recently, the CO has requested that the regional financial manager carry out a financial monitoring visit to one of the partners in South Africa for confidentiality/security reasons. According to the staff in Harare, the RO is also proactive when it comes to supporting the development of tools or of narrative reports.

3.3.3 Focus of the programme

The 2011 evaluation showed that the programme was not focused enough, with too many areas of intervention or components; Diakonia was failing to develop a programme strategy that clearly showed how the different components of the programme strengthened each other and how these components, together, contributed to the realisation of the main objective of the programme.

The transition period and the inception phase of the new programme have only partly succeeded in successfully addressing the issues raised above. On the one hand, Diakonia's programme is more focused than the previous one: the number of objectives and sectors of interventions have been reduced and there is a clear intention to focus

on gender and peace building. On the other hand, it is still difficult to uncover a clear and unifying strategic logic of intervention in the proposal that was funded by Sida. The evaluator judges that this shortcoming is due to a combination of factors. Most of them have already been underlined in different parts of this report, but it is important to synthesise them in order to highlight the challenges that Diakonia is facing when trying to transform a poorly performing programme into a relevant and effective one. We have, on several occasions in this assessment, appreciated the efforts undertaken by Diakonia to address the weaknesses from the previous programme.

However, the new programme is still in a phase of transition. Despite a new approach in its relationships with its partners, Diakonia has maintained almost the same partner portfolio. ZPP is the only new partner since January 2013 and ZCC is no longer a financial partner. Diakonia has not yet succeeded in capitalising on the conflict analysis and/or on its dialogue processes with its partners to develop a fully coherent and focused programme. Diakonia has to deal with a combination of stumbling blocks that need to be addressed: the lack of clarity of what Diakonia means by a strategic peace building programme, the lack of identification of one or two problems identified in the conflict analysis, and that the partners want to contribute to address, through the added results of their individual projects and the weakness of Diakonia's partners in gender issues; although it is a clear focus of the current programme.

The ambition of Diakonia is to expand its current programme. This expansion consists of increasing the number of partners up to 12 organisations in 2014, based on Sida's/Embassy of Sweden's approval. Diakonia has assessed its current portfolio in-depth and one of the main conclusions for several of the organisations was that it was too early to conclude whether the partner would be relevant or not in the medium term. Diakonia wants to give its partners an opportunity to demonstrate their potential in a programme where Diakonia provides real support and capacity development. The year 2013 is seen as the real trial period in this regard. Moreover, according to Diakonia, the introduction of ZPP as a new partner has brought new energy and positive competition among its current partners. Diakonia believes that bringing new partners on board will contribute to improving overall results delivery. First of all, the evaluator believes that the term of "expansion" is not appropriate in this context. The main concern for Diakonia should not be to increase the number of its partners for the sake of expanding its programme, but rather to develop a relevant portfolio.

The priority for Diakonia in the coming two years should be to reach a combination of technically competent, experienced, complementary and legitimate organisations, which, together, contribute to the realisation of the objectives of its programme. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the evaluator is convinced that this will only be possible if Diakonia first deals with the stumbling blocks that prevent the development of clear strategic priorities for its current programme. Second, increasing the number of partners might have an influence on the quality of the technical support provided by Diakonia, and the organisation might face the risk of spreading itself thin. The decision to increase the number of partners has to be accompanied by strong evidence that Diakonia has the human and technical capacities to maintain quality

support. This review is showing that the issue of increasing the portfolio is not only of a quantitative nature but also highlights the added value provided by potential new partners to the objectives of the programme.

We therefore recommend Diakonia to:

- **Define, in close collaboration with its partners, what a strategic peace building programme is, what it consists of in terms of problems to address in the context of Zimbabwe and in terms of relevant strategies to address them.**
- **Strategically choose one or two problems to address through its programme (Diakonia and its partners cannot address all the problems highlighted in the conflict analysis). This choice will depend on the experience, knowledge of the partners, and of their capacity to demonstrate an added value in addressing these problems.**
- **Further assess its current portfolio as a whole, not only individual organisations, and draw conclusions on its capacity to address and have an influence on the issues highlighted in the conflict analysis and/or on those that the partners agree to prioritise during the coming two years.**
- **Possibly change its current portfolio on the basis of the conclusions of the assessment suggested above (on qualitative and not on quantitative criteria).**

3.4 EVALUATION OF SUSTAINABILITY

3.4.1 Relationship with and support from local, national and/or regional institutions

In this section, we address the nature of the relationships developed with regional, national and/or local institutions and analyse the level of their leadership, commitment and technical capacity made available to the Diakonia programme. The 2011 evaluation showed that the relationships between Diakonia and other international actors in Zimbabwe had been extremely limited. Moreover, Diakonia had been totally absent from all of the coordinating platforms that were created by the UN system. Diakonia was virtually unknown as a development organisation when the new programme team arrived. In addition, the relationships between Diakonia and its partners were very loose and even sometimes conflict-prone.

This is another aspect of the work on which Diakonia has put a lot of emphasis and where the organisation has been particularly successful. Diakonia has geared its efforts towards improving the relationships with its partners and increasing its visibility as a relevant peace-building actor in Zimbabwe. During 2012, Diakonia invested heavily in networking, leading to a major change in the position of the organisation:

- Diakonia has developed good working relationships and direct donor harmonisation with like-minded faith-based organisations, such as Christian Aid, Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation (ICCO) Netherlands, Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) and the Church of Sweden. Similar efforts

have been made towards catholic organisations, including the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD) and Tearfund.

- Diakonia participates actively in the ACT-alliance forum in Zimbabwe and has been selected to be the advocacy focal point for Zimbabwe in the regional ACT collaboration (mainly to get a buy-in from neighbouring countries in advocacy initiatives towards the South African Development Community (SADC) and South Africa as the official mediator/facilitator of the Global Political Agreement in Zimbabwe).
- Diakonia participates in the Zimbabwe platform, hosted by Norwegian Church Aid, which is a broader coalition of Zimbabwean organisations.
- Diakonia is chairing the Core Group for Zimbabwe Council of Churches, despite not being a funding partner at this time. Diakonia plays an advisory role and believes that the time spent in this is a strategic investment and makes the organisation more visible and legitimate in the network.
- Diakonia has developed good working relationships with non-faith-based NGOs working in peace building and gender, such as the Danish Embassy, PACT, Action Aid, Norwegian Peoples Aid and the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries (HiVOS).
- Diakonia has established a working dialogue with the Fojo Media Institute, which is managing the Swedish media programme in Zimbabwe. The Diakonia CR and PO have met their partners and they are currently reflecting on the best possible form of collaboration between the two programmes. One of Diakonia's partners, Silveira House, is doing research on the role of media in conflict and working for the promotion of peace journalism.
- Diakonia has developed good working relationships with the other Swedish organisations working in Zimbabwe, including Africa Groups (based in Bulawayo), the Swedish Cooperative Centre as well as Individuell Människohjälp (based in Mutare). There is no direct collaboration as these organisations are working in different fields, but they interact and share information on a regular basis.
- Diakonia participates to the Head of Agencies Forum and to the UN security cluster meetings. The main purpose of Diakonia's participation is to share security updates and other information.

Within one year, and this was confirmed by all the external sources of information that were contacted during the field visit, Diakonia has succeeded to change its attitudes and behaviour towards the environment in which it works, with positive effects on the perception of the organisation and its programme on other actors: from being invisible and almost non-existent in international fora/networks active in Zimbabwe, the organisation is now perceived as a reliable partner bringing true added-value to international efforts towards democracy, respect for human rights and peace in the country.

3.4.2 Financial sustainability

Diakonia's programme in Zimbabwe is totally dependent on Sida's funds (CIVSAM and Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Harare). This situation is not sustainable, and both Diakonia and Sida are aware of it. Diakonia, in early 2013, developed a highly relevant resource mobilisation strategy, in which the current donor context is thoroughly analysed, potential donors are identified and Diakonia's opportunities and actions to be undertaken in order to decrease its dependency on Sida's funds are clearly developed. Discussions have started in Harare with representatives from Norway (NORAD), but they have not yet led to any concrete financial commitment. According to Sida, donors tend not to develop new partnerships in Zimbabwe and it is not easy to gain access to funding because of the uncertainty linked to the political situation.

We therefore recommend Sida to:

- **Take the initiative to facilitate contacts between Diakonia and other potentially interested donors (Norway, Finland, Denmark, Department for International Development (DFID), German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) and possibly the Australian Agency for International Development (AUSAID)), which would allow for more financial stability and sustainability for Diakonia's programme in Zimbabwe.**

We recommend Diakonia to:

- **Implement its resource mobilisation strategy and share the results on a regular basis with Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Harare.**

4 Conclusion and Recommendations

This mid-term review shows that numerous positive changes have taken place since the 2011 evaluation. Diakonia has taken the recommendations of the evaluation very seriously and has embarked upon a series of processes aimed at implementing each recommendation and at addressing the weaknesses that characterised its previous programme in Zimbabwe. Diakonia has, first of all, succeeded in putting in place an institutional set-up that is favourable to an in-depth modification of the previous programme and to the implementation of a new one. This was done through a three-fold approach (successful recruitment of new management and staff at the Harare office, greater involvement of the Regional Office in Nairobi and systematic use of competent national consultants) that proved highly relevant and effective. This new institutional set-up has laid the ground for the development of a relevant and necessary process to critically assess and learn from the shortcomings of the previous programme. It has contributed to an environment that is conducive to the development of a new programme by addressing key issues, thus helping to put the programme back on track. Diakonia has focused on restoring relationships with the partners in Zimbabwe, which had been damaged during the last three years. Diakonia has embarked on a frank dialogue with its partners aiming at critically assessing their relevance and performance while increasing their ownership of the programme through greater involvement in financial management issues, risk and conflict analysis. Diakonia has, moreover, been able to develop a capacity development strategy of remarkable quality. Finally, Diakonia has succeeded, in a short amount of time, in going from being totally unknown among international actors in Zimbabwe to being considered as a reliable partner that brings a true added value to the democratisation process in the country.

There are, however, a certain number of areas of the work that need to be improved. Diakonia still faces a series of challenges in relation to strategic planning. Despite undeniable improvement of the quality of conflict analysis, this does not clearly lead to priorities for programming. The analysis suggests that the programme deals with strategic peace building without explaining what this means for Diakonia. The current programme is more focused than the previous one, but it is still too vague: the logical framework is too general; it fails to reflect what the partners want to achieve and the results (at output and outcome levels) of Diakonia's support to its partners should be formulated in a more precise manner. The risk analysis is done in a systematic manner, but it largely focuses on the physical integrity of the partners (which is highly relevant) and neglects the potential incapacity of the partners to reach their objectives. There is, and this is the most important aspect of the work that needs to be enhanced, a need for further reflection on what the programme is really about and what it may realistically achieve within a three-year period and beyond. A crucial part of this reflection concerns the current and future portfolio of partners. The main questions are

if the portfolio is currently relevant for achieving the objectives of the programme and what types of competencies/profiles Diakonia may want to develop a partnership with. Moreover, despite improvements in the quality of relationships between Diakonia and its partners, there is still much to be done to develop a sense of partnership among the different partners themselves. The conflict analysis shows that the lack of collaboration among CSOs is a major obstacle to the emergence of an effective civil society in Zimbabwe, and the evaluator is convinced that success of the current programme depends, to a large extent, on the capacity of Diakonia to create a sense of common interest among its partners.

We recommend Sida to:

- Provide Diakonia with technical support available within the Results Framework. This support should be ideally provided during the first half of 2013.
- This support should consist of training Diakonia staff and partners in RBM and of helping Diakonia and its partners review their results frameworks included in the new programme.
- Take the initiative to facilitate contact between Diakonia and other potentially interested donors (Norway, Finland, Denmark, DFID, GIZ and possibly AU-SAID), which would allow for more financial stability and sustainability for Diakonia's programme in Zimbabwe.

We recommend Diakonia to:

- Develop, throughout the implementation of the programme, clear indicators in its capacity building logical framework. These indicators shall consist of:
 - Progress indicators showing the level of knowledge acquired during the training sessions (output level)
 - Performance indicators showing the extent to which newly acquired knowledge is being put into practice (outcome level)
 - Consider a mix of organisation-based and of collective capacity building approaches
- Plan for a capacity building process in RBM for its partners' staff and their board members. This capacity building project should focus on enhancing their skills on:
 - Methods to perform a problem analysis
 - Transforming a problem analysis into the formulation of objectives/outcomes
 - Developing strategies/activities that clearly address the causes of the problems
 - A method to integrate programme-related risks in risk analysis
 - Integrating elements of outcome mapping in Diakonia project management, especially:
 - The identification and analysis of boundary partners
 - The formulation of outcome challenges with each boundary partner, which will allow Diakonia and its partners to develop relevant and quality indicators throughout the implementation phase of their programmes.
- Plan for capacity building of its partners in methods to analyse conflicts.

- Include clear links between conflict analysis and programming in these capacity building plans.
- Plan for greater time for conflict/context analysis during the partners' meetings.
- Define, in close collaboration with its partners, what a strategic peace building programme is, what it consists of in terms of problems to address in the context of Zimbabwe and in terms of relevant strategies to address them.
- Strategically choose one or two problems to address through its programme (Diakonia and its partners cannot address all the problems highlighted in the conflict analysis). This choice will depend on the experience, knowledge of the partners, of their capacity to demonstrate an added value in addressing these problems.
- Further assess its current portfolio as a whole, not only individual organisations, and draw conclusions on needed capacity to address and have an influence on the issues highlighted in the conflict analysis and/or on those that the partners agree to address in priority during the coming two years.
- Possibly change its current portfolio on the basis of the conclusions of the assessment suggested above (on qualitative and not on quantitative criteria).
- Implement its resource mobilisation strategy and share the results on a regular basis with Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Harare.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Mid-term Review of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe

Objective of the Review

This purpose of the mid-term review is to assess the performance of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme and the capacity of Diakonia to implement the programme. The review should evaluate all programme components namely, conceptualisation, implementation/processes and proposed outcomes (results). It should place particular emphasis on programme quality, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and cooperation. The assessment will be used by Sida and Diakonia as a planning tool and basis for decision on future programme design.

Background

During 2009-2011, Diakonia implemented a country Programme in Zimbabwe, focussing on democracy, peace and security. The Programme was funded by the Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Zimbabwe and through the Diakonia frame grant from Sida CIVSAM in Sweden.

The Programme was evaluated in mid-2011.⁶ The consultant concluded that the performance of the Diakonia Programme had been mixed. There were serious weaknesses, but also promising areas for development. Among other things, most of the participating partner organisations were found to be highly relevant and important voice-bearers in the current development context of Zimbabwe. Among the weaknesses, the report mentions lack of coherence and systematic capacity development of the partner organisations.⁷

Based on the evaluation, Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Harare decided to extend the Programme an additional six months for the period January-June 2012, in order to allow Diakonia time to address the weaknesses and make use of the recommendations highlighted in the report. During this period, the Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe was developed.

⁶ Evaluation of Diaconal Programme 2009-2011; J. Gouzou, Indehvelop, Sep 2011.

⁷ Please refer to Annex 1 for a table of evaluation recommendations and Diakonia's management response.

The new Programme commenced in July 2012 and runs until the end of 2014. The Sida contribution is SEK 21, 672, 000, accounting for 85% of the budget. The Programme budget includes an already approved contribution of MSEK 3,8 from Sida CIVSAM for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2014. The budget will be channeled via local implementing partner organisations in Zimbabwe through which Diakonia works. The programme has started with 7 partners and aspires to reach 12 partners by the end of the period

Given the challenges in the previous Diakonia programme, Sida/Embassy of Sweden has decided to commission an early mid-term review in 2013 to ensure that the new programme is being implemented according to plan, to assess the room for further expansion as well as to provide input to the general direction of the programme.

Aims and Scope of the Review

The purpose of the review is to capture and assess the progress of interventions for the period June 2012-Dec 2012 towards achievement of the outcome of Diakonia's overall objective; A strengthened civil society contributing to the change of structural conditions necessary for peace, gender equality and consolidated democracy in Zimbabwe.

The specific questions to be assessed are:

1. The programme management capacity of Diakonia
2. The quality of the programme inception (January-December 2012)
3. The value addition of the programme

Recommendations and Lessons

The review is expected to provide recommendations to both Sida and Diakonia on how to further improve programme delivery and on the future direction of the programme in relation to the plan. The review shall also capture lessons that have been learnt along the way that can assist in future programming.

Methodology

The review methods shall include:

- Literature review: reading and analysing existing documentation, such as: programme documents, Diakonia's assessment of partner organisation proposals, review meeting minutes, policy and strategy documents.
- Interviews: focal group and/or individual interviews with relevant stakeholders, including Diakonia partner organisations, staff within Diakonia and the Embassy of Sweden in Harare, as well as other relevant donor organisations and/or stakeholders.
- Visiting project sites.

The review shall be participatory in approach when and where relevant and possible. Diakonia will establish a reference group, consisting of partner organisations, staff and other development actors to facilitate active participation and learning.

The consultant will further define choice of methodology.

Time Frame

The review shall be carried out in February 2013. The consultant shall be paid for a total of 20 working days.

The consultant will further define a time and work plan including travel, field visits, report writing and a feedback workshop as part of the tender for the assignment. The time and work plan, will, together with these terms of reference and the inception report, form the basis for the contract.

Reporting

Upon contracting, the consultant shall present a brief inception report on the proposed methodology and approach to the assignment. Preliminary findings from the review shall be presented and discussed with partner organisations, Diakonia and Sida at a joint feed-back workshop towards the end of the field work. The outcome of the discussions will be taken into consideration in the first written draft.

The proposed timelines for reporting are outlined as follows:

- **A first draft report** that includes highlights and an Executive summary shall be sent to Sida and Diakonia latest **28 February** 2013.
- **A second draft report** shall be sent to Diakonia latest **10 March** 2013. This report will be commented by Sida and Diakonia.

A final report including an Executive Summary shall be sent to Sida and Diakonia latest **25 March 2013**.

The report shall be structured as follows:

1. Executive summary
2. Introduction
3. Diakonia programme development
4. Findings
5. Conclusions
6. Lessons learnt for partner organisations, Diakonia and Sida
7. Recommendations, short, medium and long term
8. Annexes, including TORs and methodology applied in the assignment

The report shall be written in English and limited to a maximum of 30 pages, excluding annexes. The author should make use of and, when appropriate, quote already existing documentation.

Qualifications of the Consultant

The required qualifications of the consultant(s) are well documented knowledge of civil society development in Southern Africa, well documented experience in evaluation methodology, documented experience in organisational development methodology and fluency in English.

Annex 2 – Inception Report

Overall scope of the evaluation

The Terms of Reference (ToR) provide some background information on the project. The ToR outline and describe the rationale, purpose and scope of the assignment for the mid-term review of the Sida-supported Diakonia programme “Mid-term Review of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe”.

During 2009-2011, Diakonia implemented a country programme in Zimbabwe, focussing on democracy, peace and security. The programme was funded by Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Zimbabwe and through the Diakonia frame grant from Sida CIVSAM in Sweden. The Programme was evaluated in mid-2011.⁸ The evaluator concluded that the performance of the Diakonia Programme had been mixed. There were serious weaknesses, but also promising areas for development. Among other things, most of the participating partner organisations were found to be highly relevant and important voice-bearers in the current development context of Zimbabwe. Among the weaknesses, the report mentions a lack of coherence and systematic capacity development of the partner organisations.⁹ Based on the evaluation, Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Harare decided to extend the programme by an additional six months for the period January-June 2012, in order to allow Diakonia time to address the weaknesses and make use of the recommendations highlighted in the report. During this period, the Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe was developed.

The new Programme commenced in July 2012 and runs until the end of 2014. The Sida contribution is SEK 21,672,000, accounting for 85% of the budget. The programme budget includes an already approved contribution of MSEK 3,8 from Sida CIVSAM for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2014. The budget will be channelled via local implementing partner organisations in Zimbabwe that Diakonia works through. The programme started with 7 partners and aspires to reach 12 partners by the end of the period.

⁸ Evaluation of Diaconia Programme 2009-2011; J. Gouzou, Indehvelop, Sep 2011.

⁹ Please refer to Annex 1 for a table of evaluation recommendations and Diakonia's management response.

Given the challenges in the previous Diakonia programme, Sida/Embassy of Sweden has decided to commission an early mid-term review in 2013 to ensure that the new programme is being implemented according to plan, to assess the room for further expansion as well as to provide input to the general direction of the programme.

This purpose of the mid-term review is to assess the performance of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme and the capacity of Diakonia to implement the programme. The review should evaluate all programme components, namely: conceptualisation, implementation/processes and proposed outcomes (results). It should place particular emphasis on programme quality, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and cooperation. Sida and Diakonia will use the assessment as a planning tool and basis for decisions on future programme design.

The purpose of the review is to capture and assess the progress of interventions for the period June 2012-Dec 2012 towards the achievement of the outcome of Diakonia's overall objective: A strengthened civil society contributing to the change of structural conditions necessary for peace, gender equality and consolidated democracy in Zimbabwe.

The specific questions to be assessed are:

- The programme management capacity of Diakonia
- The quality of the programme inception (January-December 2012)
- The value addition of the programme

The review is expected to provide recommendations to both Sida and Diakonia on how to further improve programme delivery and on the future direction of the programme in relation to the plan.

The assignment has started with a brief *inception period*, which has the purpose of clarifying the users, and their intended use of the evaluation. During this phase, the evaluator has also developed the methodology and finalised the work plan, in order to ensure that the evaluation is appropriately focused to the needs of the users. A desk review of the basic programme documents has been undertaken. The evaluator met with Sida Country Director in Zimbabwe, Mr. Magnus Carlquist, on 8 January 2013 in Stockholm. Moreover, the evaluator conducted a series of conference calls with Mrs. Anna Tibblin, Diakonia's Representative in Zimbabwe. The proposed methodology has been prepared based on the analysis of the documents and on the content of the discussions with Diakonia and Sida, but also on the conclusions of the evaluation performed in September 2011. The evaluator welcomes any comments and suggestions that can improve the focus and particularly the usability of the evaluation.

Focusing the evaluation

The inception phase allowed the evaluator to focus the evaluation on two levels: the evaluation criteria and the scope. The initial ToR indicated a series of evaluation questions. In its Implementation Proposal, Indevlop suggested to amend some of the evaluation questions in order to make the assignment more feasible and to provide Sida and Diakonia with useful conclusions and recommendations. The initial ToR

stipulated two different purposes that sometimes contradict each other. We suggested simplifying the formulation of the ToR through drafting one single purpose for this assignment. Evaluating the impact of the programme would demand a series of resources (financial, technical, human and time) that are not available for this type of assignment. It is, moreover, not necessarily relevant when performing a mid-term review. Sida agreed with our suggestion to reformulate the purpose of the mid-term review as follows:

The purpose of the review is to assess the extent to which the new programme management and structure might contribute to reaching the objective of Diakonia's intervention in Zimbabwe (A strengthened civil society contributing to the change of structural conditions necessary for peace, gender equality and consolidated democracy in Zimbabwe).

Sida also agreed that this assignment addresses the following evaluation questions:

Relevance:

- Which recommendations from the previous evaluation have been implemented? Which recommendations have not been implemented and why?
- Has the programme design been articulated in a coherent structure: are the outcomes and outputs clearly articulated?
- To what extent do the activities that have been carried out address the causes of the identified problems?
- Are the programme objectives addressing identified needs of the target group(s) in Zimbabwe?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent does the programme contribute to reaching its objectives (outcomes)? In other words: are there indications that the programme contributes to reaching its outcomes?

Efficiency:

- To what extent have Diakonia's organisational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme so far?

Sustainability:

- Is the programme supported by regional/national/local institutions?
- Has the funding base been diversified? How has the work to obtain financial sustainability and reduce the dependency on Sida core support turned out?

The methods chosen to collect informants and information are described in chapter 3.

Clarification of users and intended use of the evaluation

On the donor side, the main user of the evaluation is Sida. Some other donors might, however, be interested in the final product. This review is going to help Sida to better

understand the work of Diakonia in Zimbabwe and will serve as a basis when deciding on future commitments with the organisation.

For Diakonia, the mid-term review is an opportunity to have someone from the outside reflect on the new strategies, the organisational structure and capacity put in place after the evaluation of September 2011, as well as on its accomplishments. The assessment is not only meant to look backwards but should also use the findings, insights and lessons to inform Diakonia and Sida on whether the new programme is on the right track.

The evaluation will also be an opportunity to provide evidence to potential donors and partners regarding the value of Diakonia as a partner.

Evaluation approach and methodology

General approach

This assignment integrates different methods. They are adapted to the various types of informants and information that the evaluator believes are necessary to approach and to collect. The evaluator is, together with Diakonia Representative, developing a detailed evaluation matrix. The final matrix will be attached as an annex to the final evaluation report. The evaluator proposes to incorporate a mix of three key methods that will allow us to analyse the information in a variety of ways:

Analysis of the available documentation. Analysis of all relevant documents provided by Diakonia (proposal, narrative reports of the programme as a whole and of each specific partner, publications related or not to the projects, capacity building material, evaluation of each partner), analysis of documents provided by Sida (assessment memos, decisions, communication between Sida and Diakonia), analysis of documents provided by Diakonia's partner organisations.

Interviews. The evaluator intends to use different interview techniques, depending on the type of information that needs to be collected.

One-on-one interviews with key informants. This method will be used primarily with Diakonia leadership in Zimbabwe and with Sida representatives working at the Embassy of Sweden in Harare. Key informants who do not belong to Diakonia staff will be selected in function of the type of information that the evaluator needs in order to assess the relevance and the effectiveness of Diakonia. The one-on-one interviews will be conducted using a mix of forced-choice questions (mainly aimed at clarifying the role of the informant in Diakonia-supported programme or specific activity) and of open-ended questions aimed at collecting the perception of the informant on the strategy used by Diakonia and the possible effects that the intervention has had on his/her organisation or on the process he/she participated in.

Focus Group Interviews (FGIs). This method will mainly be used with Diakonia staff in Harare and with Diakonia's partner organisations. The FGIs will be conducted using open-ended and one-dimensional questions that allow the respondents to elaborate

on the questions and build on each other's answers. This method will mainly be used to assess the relevance of Diakonia's programme and the efficiency of the organisation. For these two purposes, a set of questions aimed at collecting relevant information will be prepared. Both one-on-one interviews and FGIs will use semi-structured questions. Departing from prepared sets of questions, the evaluator will also let the respondents talk about what is important to them. This approach, which sometimes allows the interviewees to bring in aspects or issues other than those planned by the evaluator, has proven very useful in adding qualitative information to purely structured interviews.

The inception phase was limited in time to allow a full-fledged analysis of the partners and key informants to be interviewed during the evaluation. This will continue as a work in progress. Complementary information might be made available to Sida upon demand throughout the evaluation process. The final evaluation report will, however, provide extensive details on this aspect of the assignment.

Evaluation criteria and questions

Assessing relevance

The relevance criterion is meant to assess the extent to which the outcomes/objectives of a project or a programme are valid and adequate, whether in their initial form or after they have been adjusted. The relevance criterion allows answering the following question: Does Diakonia (and, whenever the case, its implementing partners) do the right thing?

What does doing the right thing mean? Doing the right thing or being relevant implies two things:

- To what extent are the strategy and the programme of Diakonia appropriate in relation to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?
- To what extent are the strategy and the programme of Diakonia appropriate in relation to the objectives defined in Sida's Strategy for Zimbabwe?

The relevance criterion is also meant to focus on the logic of a given intervention, on its consistency. Assessing relevance means, thus, to evaluate the extent to which the activities and outputs of the programme are consistent with the attainment of its objectives.

Finally, and beyond the two dimensions mentioned above, the relevance criterion is also meant to investigate the reactivity of organisations. Does Diakonia take into account changes in the environment in which the organisation intervenes? The following two questions will guide our thoughts in that matter:

- To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?
- If any, are the new activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended effects?

As Diakonia's programme started only six months ago, these two questions might not be a major focus for this evaluation.

In order to be as objective and transparent as possible, a two-step qualitative rating system will be applied to the assessment questions. The evaluator will use the same method as the one used for the evaluation of September 2011. This will allow for a comparative analysis and for a systematic assessment of the progress made by Diakonia and its partners.

First step: The evaluator will provide a grade for each question (Cf. Box 1) and comments explaining/justifying the reason for the grade.

Box 1: The grading system:

D: not performed by Diakonia because it is not in the organisation's mandate
C: not done by Diakonia, although it could/should have been
B: Diakonia attempts to do it, but there is room for improvement
A: Diakonia does it well

Second step: Synthesise findings for each chapter.

- The evaluator will count the number of A, B, C and/or Ds.
- The evaluator will synthesise the comments in order to give a global picture of the relevance of Diakonia. This results in a rating system that is presented in Box 2.

Box 2: The rating system

Doubtful relevance: majority of D or C
Organisation potentially relevant: majority of B
Organisation highly relevant: majority of A

Assessing effectiveness

The evaluation will try to address two main issues:

- To what extent do the activities of Diakonia's programme contribute to reaching its outputs?
- To what extent does the programme contribute to reaching its objectives (outcomes)?

This part of the evaluation is going to be challenging, as Diakonia's programme is in a starting phase. Prior to the field visit, the evaluator will establish a detailed list of activities that have been implemented in order to clarify what is reasonable to be evaluated.

Assessing efficiency

The efficiency criterion aims at assessing the extent to which the human (and financial resources) have been used in an optimal manner. As mentioned in section 1 of this report, the evaluation will focus on the following question: To what extent have Diakonia's organisational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme so far?

This is an important aspect of the review, as the evaluation performed in September 2011 had highlighted a series of deficiencies at that level. The evaluator will use the recommendations from the evaluation to structure this part of the review and assess the progress made by Diakonia on efficiency.

The review will mainly focus on assessing the extent to which Diakonia:

- Has recruited some technical staff for the Harare office, with competencies in capacity development and in the thematic area(s) that the programme is focusing on; and/or
- Is using more systematically competent local consultants to perform the capacity development dimension of Diakonia's work; and/or
- Has revised its thematic priorities; and/or
- Has mobilised more resources from the Nairobi office as a more systematic technical support to the Harare staff.

Assessing sustainability

The review will mainly focus on two questions that were highlighted as weaknesses in the previous evaluation:

- Is the programme supported by regional/national/local institutions?
- Has the funding base been diversified? How has the work to obtain financial sustainability and reduce the dependency on Sida core support turned out?

Apart from making sure that the gathered information answers the evaluation questions, our approach and the focus on the utilisation will ensure that the evaluation process allows Diakonia, its partners and stakeholders to reflect on their work and, thus, learn from the evaluation process.

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources and Information Collection Method
Relevance Which recommendations from the previous evaluation have been implemented? Which recommendations have not been implemented and why? Has the programme design been articulated in a coherent structure: are the outcomes and outputs clearly articulated? To what extent do the activities carried out address the causes of problems identified? Are the programme objectives addressing identified needs of the target group(s) in Zimbabwe?	Analysis of relevant documentation: Diakonia: Proposal, narrative reports of the programme as a whole and of each specific partner projects, publications related or not to the projects, capacity building material Sida documents: assessment memos, decisions, communication between Sida and Diakonia Relevant documents provided by Diakonia's partner organisations. One-on-one interviews with Diakonia leadership in Harare FGIs with Diakonia staff in Harare FIGs with partner organisations One-on-one interviews with representatives from institutions that Diakonia tries to influence through its programme in Zimbabwe (if possible)
Effectiveness To what extent do the activities of Diakonia's programme contribute to reaching its outputs? To what extent does the programme contribute to reaching its objectives (outcomes)?	One-on-one interviews with Diakonia leadership in Harare FGIs with Diakonia staff in Harare FIGs with partner organisations One-on-one interviews with representatives from institutions that Diakonia tries to influence through its programme in Zimbabwe (if possible)
Efficiency To what extent has Diakonia recruited technical staff for the Harare office, with competencies in capacity development and in the thematic area(s) that the programme is focusing on; and/or Used more systematically com-	One-on-one interviews with Diakonia leadership in Harare FGIs with Diakonia staff in Harare FIGs with partner organisations One-on-one interviews with representatives from

petent local consultants to perform the capacity development dimension of Diakonia's work; and/or Revised its thematic priorities; and/or Mobilised more resources from the Nairobi office as a more systematic technical support to the Harare staff?	institutions that Diakonia tries to influence through its programme in Zimbabwe (if possible) Analysis of relevant documentation: Diakonia: Proposal, narrative reports of the programme as a whole and of each specific partner projects, publications related or not to the projects, capacity building material Sida documents: assessment memos, decisions, communication between Sida and Diakonia Relevant documents provided by Diakonia's partner organisations.
Sustainability Is the programme supported by regional/national/local institutions? Has the funding base been diversified? How has the work to obtain financial sustainability and reduce the dependency on Sida core support turned out?	One-on-one interviews with Diakonia leadership in Harare FGIs with Diakonia staff in Harare FIGs with partner organisations One-on-one interviews with representatives from institutions that Diakonia tries to influence through its programme in Zimbabwe (if possible)

Annex 2 – Preliminary Work Plan and Schedule

Date	Time	Activity	Place	Participants
28-01-2013 - 04-02-2013		Inception phase	Stockholm	JG
04-02-2013		Inception report delivered		JR, JG
04.02.2013- 13.02.2013		Desk study Prepare plans for field visits: contact with Diakonia and Sida in Harare Finalising interview questions		JG JG, Diakonia JG
14.02.2013 - 24.02.2013		Field visit		JG
22.02.2013		Debriefing: sharing of preliminary findings and lessons, and joint reflection		JG Diakonia Embassy of Sweden in Harare
23.02.2013- 28.01.2013		Report writing		JG, JE
		Quality assurance by Indevelop		JR, IC
28.02.2013		Submission of draft report		JR, JG
05.03.2013		Comments on draft report		Sida
		Quality assurance by Indevelop		JR, IC
11.03.2013		Submission of final report		JR, JG

Annex 3 – List of Persons Interviewed

Names	Organisation	Position
Focus Group International and National NGOs		
Tomas Deve	SEATINI-Southern and Eastern Africa, Trade Information Negotiations Initiative	Director
Kennedy Mugochi	HiVOS- Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Development	Programme Officer
Joel Murungu	Action AID International (AAI)	Country Representative
Fambai Ngirande	ICCO Inter-Church Cooperation	Country Manager
Diakonia Staff, Focus Group		
Regis Mtutu	Diakonia, CO	Programme Officer
Luz Baastrup	Diakonia, RO	Deputy Regional Manager
Onismo Poterai	Diakonia, CO	Finance Officer
Individual Interviews		
Anna Tibblin	Diakonia	Country Representative
Luz Baastrup	Diakonia, RO	Deputy Regional Manager
Douglas Tigere	SCMZ	National Coordinator
Tayson Mudakiri	YETT	Programme Manager
National Consultants, Focus Group		
Wonder Phiri	Millenium Resources Consulting	Consultant
Tsitsi Maradze		Consultant
ACPDT, Focus Group		
Kathy Bond-Stewart	ACPDT	Publications Coordinator
Leticia Harry	ACPDT	Finance Coordinator
Lucy Manyuchi	ACPDT	Capacity Building Coordinator
Silveira House, Focus Group		
Gibson Munyoro	SH	Director
Decent Gaura	SH	Project Coordinator
Cleopatra Wilson	SH	Finance Officer
Kudzaishe Mabaya	SH	Project Officer
Sida meetings		

Magnus Carlquist	Sida/Embassy of Sweden Harare	Country Director
Aquilina Mawadza	Embassy of Sweden Harare	Programme Officer

Annex 4 – Documents Consulted

Sida documents

Agreement Between Sida and Diakonia on Support of the Diakonia Zimbabwe Strategic Peace Building Programme during 1 July 2012 – 31 December 2014

Appraisal of Intervention: Diakonia Zimbabwe Strategic Peace Building Programme 1 July 2012 – 31 December 2014, 9 p

Decision on Contribution, Diakonia Zimbabwe Strategic Peace Building Programme 1 July 2012 – 31 December 2014, 6 p

Amendment to the Agreement on Development Cooperation, October 2012, 2 p

Decision on Amendment, 21 June 2012, 2 p

Diakonia documents

Programme Proposal, Strategic Peace Building in Zimbabwe, March 2012, 47 p

Conflict Analysis, 18 November 2011, 21 p

End of Programme Report, Jan 2009 – June 2012, 20 p

Silveira House Proposal, Socio Economic Research and Analysis, July 2012 – 31 December 2014, 18 p

Diakonia Silveira House Demo, 9 p

ACPDPT Proposal, Building Constructive Relationships Across the Divides, July 2012 – 31 December 2014, 21 p

Diakonia ACPDPT Demo, 17 August 2012, 9 p

DPHI, Zimbabwe Democracy Empowerment Project, July 2012 – 31 December 2014, 26 p

Diakonia DPHI Demo, 20 August 2012, 9 p

SCMZ, Strengthening Youth Participation in Strategic Peace Building and Civic Advocacy in Zimbabwe, July 2012 – 31 December 2014, 21 p

Diakonia SCMZ Demo, 19 July 2012, 10 p

YETT, Youth Driving the Peace Building Process, July 2012 – July 2015, 25 p

Diakonia YETT Demo, 30 July 2012, 10 p

ZPP, Promoting Transitional Justice and National Healing Mechanisms through Monitoring and Documentation of Politically Motivated Human Rights Abuses, 42 p

Diakonia ZPP Demo, 18 December 2012, 8 p

Report Diakonia Partner Conference 15 - 16 May 2012, 4 p

Report Diakonia Partner Conference 2 – 4 October 2012, 17 p

Partner Satisfaction Survey, January 2013, 19 p

Minutes Planning Meeting Sida and Diakonia, 7 August 2012, 4 p

Minutes Planning Meeting Sida and Diakonia, 12 November 2012, 2 p

Diakonia Management Reports Country Office to Regional Office:

- April 2012, 4 p
- May 2012, 4 p
- June 2012, 4p
- July 2012, 3 p
- August 2012, 3 p
- September 2012, 3 p
- October 2012, 6 p
- November 2012, 5 p
- December 2012, 4 p
- January 2013, 6 p

Diakonia Capacity Building Strategy, Zimbabwe Strategic Peace Building Programme, Draft version February 2013, 12 p

Diakonia Strategy for Resource Mobilisation 2013 – 2014, Final Draft February 2013, 5 p



Mid-term Review of the Diakonia Strategic Peace Building Programme in Zimbabwe

This report presents the findings of the mid-term review of Diakonia's Strategic Peace Building programme in Zimbabwe for the period 2012-2014, funded by Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Zimbabwe. This mid-term review shows that numerous positive changes have taken place since the previous evaluation in 2011. The new institutional set-up has laid the ground for the development of a relevant and necessary process for critically assessing and learning from the shortcomings of the previous programme. Diakonia has been able to develop a capacity development strategy of remarkable quality, and is now considered as a reliable partner adds value to the democratisation process in the country.

Diakonia still faces a series of challenges in relation to strategic planning; the conflict analysis does not clearly lead to priorities for programming, the logical framework is too general and fails to reflect what the partners want to achieve. There is a need for further reflection on what the programme is really about and what it may realistically achieve. The review also shows that the success of the current programme depends, to a large extent, on the capacity of Diakonia to create a sense of common interest among its partners.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Postgiro: 1 56 34-9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

